

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

+ + + + +

DESIGN FEASIBILITY OF  
NATIONAL TESTS IN READING AND MATH

+ + + + +

MEETING FOUR

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,  
MARCH 4, 1997

+ + + + +

The meeting was held in the Barnard Auditorium in the Federal Office Building (FOB-10) at 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 2411, Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Acting Deputy Secretary, Mike Smith, Chairman, presiding.

Present:

Mike Smith, Chairman

Sue Betka

Helen Chang

Joseph Conaty

Gary Phillips

Also Present:

Linda Bennett

George Elford

Steve Gorman

Calvin Jones

Barb Kapimus

Adina Kole

Anmarie Lippert

Tammy McAlister

Daniel Minchew

April Osajima

Larry Snowwhite

Alan Thiemann

Gabriela Uro

Paul Weckstein

## C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

	<u>Page</u>
Overview and Purpose of Meeting	4
Legal and Contractual Issues	19
Design of the National Reading and Math Tests	21
QuestionS and Discussion of Technical Issues	23

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:49 a.m.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Why don't we get started. It's after the starting time. Are people going to testify? I wonder why we have that arrangement.

MR. CONATY: It's just so that the mikes will pick people up.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay.

MR. CONATY: That's all.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. This is going to be an open meeting. I think folks will stay, you folks up front will stay as long as there are questions and issues. The meeting is on the record. It will all be transcribed and it will be put, the actual transcript within a week will be placed on the World Wide Web, so anybody will be able to draw this down. It's the same process we used for the other open meetings. I guess we've had three.

MR. PHILLIPS: Two, this is the third one.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: The third open meeting.

1       The first transcript should be on the Web today  
2       because it was last week was the first of the  
3       meetings.

4               By coming to this meeting and engaging in  
5       this discussion, as you will soon hear officially,  
6       you give up no rights to be able to bid for any  
7       contract that results from this effort, this whole  
8       overall mission.

9               Typically, we don't have these open  
10       meetings before the initiative, but we wanted to seek  
11       out as much comment as possible, and we have the  
12       right to do that as long as we make everything free  
13       and available and open, in this case, the World Wide  
14       Web or through some sort of publication.

15               Why don't I talk for about a minute or so  
16       and then we'll turn it over to Gary and he will lay  
17       out the basic -- Helen will fill you in on your  
18       rights, you haven't lost any, so she can do that  
19       quickly, then Gary can pursue the technical side of  
20       the development of the test and some of the decisions  
21       that are built into our assumptions and some of the  
22       decisions that aren't, some of the ways we're going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to proceed, that we're still open for all sorts of  
2 advice and thought about.

3 The idea of having individual assessments  
4 for fourth grade reading and eighth grade math comes  
5 from a variety of different points. It's developed  
6 over a period of about six months or so. As people  
7 in the Administration and outside began to realize  
8 that the standards movement was undergoing two  
9 changes: on the one hand it was being generally  
10 accepted by folks in the public and in the education  
11 profession, standards were being developed by almost  
12 every state, by lots of local communities, ideas  
13 about aligning assessments with standards, lots of  
14 discussion about challenging standards and of course,  
15 lots of debate about the nature of some of the  
16 standards out there, particularly in areas like  
17 history and science and so on where there are  
18 controversial issues. And debate actually about  
19 other -- even the basics, reading and math, about how  
20 to teach them, in particular, not so much about the  
21 outcomes, not the general achievement that we would  
22 like to see students gain from instruction in reading

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and math, but certainly some controversy about the  
2 nature of instruction and so on and how that gets  
3 reflected and how it affects standards.

4 On the one hand we have a nation that's  
5 moving toward thinking hard and debating about what  
6 its children should learn and be able to do, coming  
7 out of school experiences. On the other hand,  
8 however, for those of you who have looked closely at  
9 Ed Week and at the AFT reports and so on, on the  
10 nature of standards out there, it turns out that a  
11 lot of them don't have the rigor and aren't as  
12 challenging as lots of folks would like to see them.

13 In many cases they represent a minimum set of  
14 expectations and that concerns the people in the  
15 Administration. It concerns a lot of the people out  
16 there working to reform the schools.

17 It means for one thing, at least I  
18 believe it means for one thing, that we are going to,  
19 in those states and in those communities that accept  
20 lower standards, it means that we will continue to  
21 tolerate one kind of curriculum and one kind of  
22 instruction, one kind of set of expectations for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 poor and the most disadvantaged in our country, while  
2 acknowledging, of course, that the more well to do,  
3 the more advantaged, those in the suburbs and in  
4 private schools and so on will get another curriculum  
5 and we will tacitly let that go on. But we'll say,  
6 "Well gosh, we've got standards, folks, and isn't it  
7 wonderful that all of our kids passed these  
8 standards," when in fact, the standards themselves  
9 are effectively meaningless.

10 That is intolerable, in our view, in my  
11 view personally. I believe it's intolerable in the  
12 Secretary's view and in the President's view.

13 We should have a common set of  
14 expectations and standards, but they should high.  
15 They should be challenging and every child should be  
16 prepared to meet them. That's really the cornerstone  
17 there.

18 So faced with those two issues, that is  
19 on the one hand standards movement was moving along  
20 and on the other hand, it kind of hit a plateau of  
21 sorts, a plateau where people looked out and they saw  
22 some sets of standards that weren't really up to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 kinds of standards, in effect, that we would like to  
2 see them reach.

3 The question then was how do we move the  
4 system, how do we re-energize the system so that it  
5 doesn't just go by the book, that is, it doesn't just  
6 generate some content standards and some low  
7 performance standards and some mediocre tests and so  
8 on. How do we energize the system to really make  
9 available to all kids challenging curriculum, well-  
10 trained teachers and so on.

11 And there are a lot of different, a lot  
12 of different alternatives looked at. An alternative  
13 came up that rose to the top was to put out a  
14 challenging individual test in each of two areas.  
15 First of all, in the basic skills, in mathematics and  
16 reading. Second of all, in key performance areas in  
17 the basic skills.

18 For those of you who are teachers or who  
19 have been teachers or who have had kids, we all know  
20 that fourth grade, to be able to read independently  
21 by the end of third grade and into fourth grade is a  
22 really critical skill. If you haven't got that,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1     you're going to have a very tough time in schools.  
2     First of all, most teachers don't continue teaching  
3     reading after the middle or end of fourth grade.  
4     Second of all, you're expected to learn -- expected  
5     to read independently and to learn science and  
6     history and other -- literature, and so on, by  
7     reading, by your actively reading, by yourself.  
8     That's reading independently and if you can't read,  
9     you're going to fall further and further behind in  
10    each of those areas.

11                 Reading at fourth grade in our society,  
12    in our society -- other societies treat it  
13    differently. Other societies may continue to teach  
14    reading and so on, but our society doesn't seem to.  
15    Reading in fourth grade is a critical transition  
16    period that is absolutely at the heart of educational  
17    equity, absolutely at the heart of it because it's  
18    not the suburban kids, the middle income kids who  
19    fail to learn to read independently by fourth grade.

20    It is the poor, it is the bilingual, it is the kids  
21    who are labeled as disabled because they can't do  
22    that.

1           So reading is at the core of learning in  
2 many ways, the ability to use language, the ability  
3 to understand language in a form that can be  
4 communicated person to person, the ability to use the  
5 interactive abilities, the ability to communicate  
6 with people, all of that, reading is critical.

7           The second basic as we all know is  
8 mathematics. And mathematics, well, reading also  
9 teaches a logic in its own sense and an appreciation  
10 for art and so on. Mathematics really focuses very,  
11 very concretely on logic, on the ability to solve  
12 problems and the understanding that things can be two  
13 or three -- can have two or three different levels to  
14 them that you have to go through two or three steps  
15 in order to understand something.

16           And of course, in mathematics,  
17 mathematics isn't always complete certainty. There  
18 is in some solution of some mathematics problems  
19 issues of estimation, issues of ways of  
20 representation which take a creative idea, so  
21 mathematics isn't just algorithmic. You can't just  
22 plug something in. You have to think imaginatively

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and creatively to solve a lot of problems.

2           It allows you represents all sorts of  
3 things in society. It allows you to become skilled  
4 enough to put a home improvement in your own home, if  
5 you can understand the representations of geometry  
6 and relationships between algebra and geometry and so  
7 on. Most of all, in our society, there's another  
8 tipping point, there's another time, there's another  
9 transition period, a transition period is about  
10 eighth grade. A lot of arithmetic and a preparation  
11 for learning more formal mathematics happens before  
12 ninth grade. It happens up to and through eighth  
13 grade. We see at eighth grade a beginning of a real  
14 bifurcation or a trifurcation in society. Students  
15 in eighth grade in our country are put into different  
16 tracks, willy-nilly put into different tracks and  
17 tracks that often follow them through high school.  
18 They're not able to get out of those tracks. Those  
19 tracks are dependent upon what courses they take in  
20 eighth grade algebra. That determines what courses -  
21 - eighth grade math -- what courses they're able to  
22 take in high school mathematics and in small high

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 schools. That often determines the entire set of  
2 courses, the alternatives to take throughout your  
3 entire high school career.

4 Now, mathematics is also influenced by  
5 the publication, our thinking about mathematics was  
6 also influenced by the publication of the third year  
7 national math and science study, the eighth grade  
8 results from it show that mathematics in the United  
9 States was below the international average. But more  
10 importantly, it gave a lot of indications about why  
11 the U.S. scored below the international average, not  
12 surprisingly, because our own research in the U.S.  
13 had pointed to this over the last two decades.

14 The differences between the way our  
15 children were taught and the way children were taught  
16 in countries where -- which countries that were more  
17 successful in mathematics rested on two big  
18 differences. One was in instruction. One was in  
19 content. There's not a lot else to teaching and  
20 learning except instruction and content. We  
21 instructed our kids differently. We taught them  
22 differently than other countries did and we gave them

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a different content than other countries do. The  
2 content we gave them was nowhere near as challenging  
3 and the nature of the instruction did not engage them  
4 in the way the nature of instruction did in countries  
5 that were really competent in teaching their kids  
6 mathematics.

7 Those are two damning, terribly damning  
8 lines of argument, that we can't give our kids the  
9 nature of instruction we should be giving them and  
10 the kinds of content we should be giving them.

11 We've known it for a long time and yet we  
12 haven't gone about and done it. Now where it is  
13 happening, where the content is more challenging,  
14 again is in the suburbs, again is in the more  
15 advantaged places. Where the content is least  
16 challenging is again in the places where the poor  
17 are, where the limited English proficient are, folks  
18 for one reason or another don't have the political  
19 power to gain to put into their schools the kinds of  
20 instruction their kids should be getting.

21 So we have now two spots in the  
22 curriculum that are absolutely critical to our

1 students, the nation's students, being successful  
2 throughout school. One is in reading at fourth grade  
3 and one is in mathematics at eighth grade.

4 We also have two tests which are very  
5 powerful out there, two assessments: a NAEP  
6 assessment at fourth grade and a TIMSS assessment at  
7 eighth grade. We've actually got a third assessment,  
8 another NAEP assessment, this one in mathematics at  
9 the eighth grade.

10 So we have agreed upon assessments,  
11 assessments that people take seriously throughout the  
12 country, that most states are giving to their  
13 students on a sampling basis.

14 Our sense was that what we need to do was  
15 to step up the power, the message that all students  
16 should be achieving to the higher standards by making  
17 available to all students, all students, not just a  
18 sample, and not just a sample of a part of a test  
19 which is the way NAEP is constructed, but making  
20 available to all students in all classes at fourth  
21 grade in reading an assessment that tracked the NAEP  
22 and in eighth grade, math, an assessment to track

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 both the NAEP and the TIMSS and the third year  
2 national math and science study.

3           So we'll be able to say where a student  
4 falls in fourth grade on reading against the national  
5 assessment, where an individual student falls. Is  
6 the student reading in the basic level, at a  
7 proficient level, at an advanced level? Same thing  
8 is true at eighth grade and also in eighth grade  
9 we'll be able to say what is the predicted score on  
10 the TIMSS test for that student? Did they come at or  
11 above the international medium, for example? Did  
12 they come in the top 10 percent internationally, and  
13 so on and so on?

14           That's what you're going to hear  
15 described. You're going to hear described the  
16 process of developing that assessment, the nature of  
17 some of the decisions that we face, how we expect to  
18 see that assessment get delivered, in effect, how  
19 it's made available to all fourth graders in 1999,  
20 how it's made available to all eighth graders in 1999  
21 and beyond, how eventually, that is shortly actually,  
22 not even eventually, but shortly after it's made

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 available to those students in a protected form, that  
2 is, in a form where it's not released to the public,  
3 it will be released to the public, so that everybody  
4 will be able to see that test and think about it and  
5 talk about it.

6 How materials will be developed around those two  
7 tests to help teachers and parents and others work  
8 with their students.

9 Behind this is not just that story, but  
10 there's also in the Department and across the  
11 Departments of this government are powerful campaigns  
12 that will be launched between now to 1999 and beyond  
13 1999. They will focus on bringing on all kids to the  
14 point of being able to read successfully and  
15 independently in fourth grade. We already have an  
16 America Reads effort as we all know. That isn't just  
17 the legislation for America Reads. It is also a lot  
18 of effort going into Title I; a lot of effort going  
19 into IDEA; a lot of effort by tutors all around the  
20 government and all around the country; a lot of  
21 effort mobilizing people not just as tutors, but the  
22 International Reading Association has been brought

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       into this. We have 54 or 55 partners in what we call  
2       Read Right Now in the Department which includes  
3       Reading is Fundamental and the Urban League and a  
4       whole bunch of other organizations that are helping  
5       us mobilize people all over the country to really  
6       make a push in this area.

7               The same thing is true in mathematics. I  
8       can imagine mobilizing the engineers of the country  
9       to come out and work in schools and work after  
10      schools and so on. They've already begun to sign up  
11      for that. We will have a task force run by the  
12      President's Science Advisor and by the Domestic  
13      Policy Council. We're initially with US and NSF on  
14      it and then with Departments all over the government  
15      being involved in it.

16             There are, again, organizations like the  
17      National Council of Teachers of Mathematics who are  
18      ready to mobilize their folks, the AAA as the  
19      National Academy of Science, etcetera, etcetera,  
20      etcetera. There are literally hundreds, if not  
21      thousands of organizations that are enthusiastic,  
22      excited about the idea of really focusing, really

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 focusing their attention on helping kids achieve well  
2 in mathematics by eight grade and, of course, learn  
3 how to read independently by the end of fourth grade.

4 Let me stop there and Gary will go into  
5 detail on this. Helen, you want to make a -- share a  
6 few words?

7 MS. CHANG: Yes, I'd like to say a few  
8 words and make a few announcements. My name is Helen  
9 Chang and I'm a contracting officer here at the  
10 Department of Education, and as such have a legal  
11 responsibility to see that our procurements are  
12 conducted in the full, open manner, in accordance  
13 with the Federal Acquisition Regulations.

14 As of today, you probably know, we  
15 anticipate that we are going to need contractual help  
16 to get done with the President's initiative. We  
17 can't do it by ourselves and in order to fulfill this  
18 requirement in the best manner, we are asking for  
19 public comment. We need to do market research and  
20 FAR requires that we go out and try and glean from  
21 the community and know what we're going to do and how  
22 it would be best to purchase it, and that's really

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the purpose of our meeting today, is to talk to the  
2 public and open up dialogue and communication as to  
3 how we can best fulfill the effort that we need to  
4 do.

5 Here at the Department we do have a  
6 principle. We operate under the principle that all  
7 our procurements are conducted in a fair and open  
8 manner. We intend to and always strive to get the  
9 maximum amount of information to all our potential  
10 offerors and to do it in a fair and open equal  
11 manner. That's why we will be taped today. I want  
12 to remind you and others will remind you again that  
13 we'd like you to give us your comments and please be  
14 sure to tell us your name and where you're from. We  
15 are taping this. We intend to put the transcript on  
16 the Web. This will eliminate any potential advantage  
17 that you might have being here in D.C. versus others  
18 that would be other places in the country.

19 This is the third public meeting we've  
20 had and very shortly you will start seeing the  
21 transcripts of those meetings appear on the Web.

22 We also anticipate that we will have a

1 draft solicitation and that draft statement of work  
2 will be placed on the Web and then invite public  
3 comments as to how we anticipate the statement of  
4 work and the first contracts to look.

5 You'll see that announcement in the  
6 Commerce Business Daily when it is available on the  
7 Web.

8 There are other ways that we're trying to  
9 get the public involved and gain information and one  
10 of those is we're considering a pre-solicitation  
11 conference.

12 Basically, we welcome you again and we  
13 want to have this as a free and open dialogue, but  
14 please do remember to tell us your name when you come  
15 forward to talk.

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, any questions  
17 about what this -- what is that buzzing sound?

18 MR. PHILLIPS: Do you need the  
19 microphone?

20 Thank you for coming. What I would like  
21 to do is to describe in some detail what the plan is,  
22 how we intend to accomplish this.

1                   Please feel free to ask any questions as  
2   I go along because we have plenty of time and the  
3   more questions you ask, the better it is for us. It  
4   gives us a chance to hear what you're thinking and to  
5   also think through issues as they come up.

6                   There are a couple of decisions that have  
7   been made that come more or less directly from the  
8   White House, so these are not decisions that are  
9   negotiable at this point.

10                  MR. CONATY:   Some of you have received  
11   this a couple of times --

12                  CHAIRMAN SMITH: This has a date on it.  
13   This is a continuous work in progress, so take one  
14   even if you have one.

15                  MR. ELFORD:   Is it different from the  
16   others?

17                  CHAIRMAN SMITH: A little bit, yes. Each  
18   iteration is a little bit different. This is in  
19   science now and history.

20                  (Laughter.)

21                  CHAIRMAN SMITH: It's a minor change.

22                  (Laughter.)

1                   MR. PHILLIPS:   These are some decisions  
2       which at this point are not negotiable so I'll let  
3       you know what these are and then we'll get into more  
4       details in a moment.

5                   What we're going to be developing here  
6       will be two tests that will provide an annual  
7       indication of overall student proficiency.   Now "an  
8       indication" means that this is an indicator score.  
9       We will not have the sort of diagnostic information  
10      that many tests provide like the norm-referenced  
11      tests and some of the state testing programs.   This  
12      is intended to be an overall global estimate of a  
13      proficiency in reading and mathematics.

14                  If it turns out that we can do that, then  
15      we will, but we're not guaranteeing it up front that  
16      we'll be able to do that.

17                  It will be in reading at grade four and  
18      mathematics at grade eight and the intent is to  
19      report back to staff and teachers.   So this is not a  
20      survey like NAEP or TIMSS which reports on groups of  
21      students.   It's a report on an individual student.  
22      So it will be a lot like the test scores that you get

1 in an norm-referenced testing program and in the  
2 state and local testing programs.

3 MR. THIEMANN: Gary Allen Thiemann, CTV.

4 On the NAEP and TIMSS standards, are we going to be  
5 provided what it's like?

6 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. In fact, those are -  
7 - you can get those through the NAGB Web site now.  
8 We're going to have them also available through this  
9 Web site and so when you actually go to the NAGB Web  
10 site and see the standards there.

11 MR. THIEMANN: Did NAGB participate in  
12 the development of the original TIMSS standards?

13 MR. PHILLIPS: No, NAGB did not  
14 participate in the TIMSS standards. NAGB developed  
15 the NAGB standards. The TIMSS standards were  
16 developed through an international consensus process.

17 MR. THIEMANN: Representative of the  
18 United States?

19 MR. PHILLIPS: I'd have to check with the  
20 TIMSS people there. It was -- I just don't  
21 personally know.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: NCES was on it.

1                   MR. PHILLIPS: That's in the document.

2                   MR. GORMAN: The content standards are

3 for the math and reading.

4                   MR. PHILLIPS: Right.

5                   MR. GORMAN: The achievement standards

6 are based upon the TIMSS.

7                   MR. THIEMANN: Pardon?

8                   MR. GORMAN: The content, framework,

9 using the math data.

10                  MR. PHILLIPS: Right, are you referring

11 to content or performance standards?

12                  MR. THIEMANN: Content standards.

13                  MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, that's right. So

14 NAEP developed the reading and math, reading at grade

15 four, math at grade eight and then we also have the

16 TIMSS standards, content framework at grade eight as

17 well.

18                  All three of those, if they're not

19 already on the Web, they will be on the Web.

20                  I'll make sure that happens.

21                  CHAIRMAN SMITH: We had an earlier

22 meeting, a group of experts in math and reading and

1 testing and so on and their consensus was that in  
2 mathematics that the NAEP framework was a superior  
3 framework for our purposes. It had more detail than  
4 the TIMSS framework. There was some compromises in  
5 the TIMSS framework, whenever you put together an  
6 international framework, you're developing a  
7 consensus process, in effect, 45 or 50 nations. The  
8 sense was that there were parts of the TIMSS  
9 framework that didn't really represent the kinds of  
10 curriculum that were intended to be taught in the  
11 United States.

12 So we're still able to match it up.  
13 There isn't huge differences, but there were enough  
14 differences and that the richness of the eighth grade  
15 math framework, those two arguments argued for having  
16 us use the NAEP eighth grade framework.

17 We're also able to equate the eighth  
18 grade NAEP with the eighth grade TIMSS which gives us  
19 the capacity, as Gary said, to both have the score on  
20 the test itself and also do predictive scores on NAEP  
21 and on TIMSS from the eighth grade math test. So  
22 it's kind of the best of all worlds, I think.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. PHILLIPS:   Okay, and other givens is  
2           that the reading test is -- this is a test of reading  
3           in English.   That's an important factor to keep in  
4           mind.

5                   The reading test and the math test will  
6           provide national standards for NAEP, is what Mike  
7           just mentioned, and the math will also provide  
8           international standards for TIMSS.   This will be done  
9           through a linking strategy.

10                  Items will be released to the public  
11           every year so there will be a certain time in which  
12           the test administration is over.   Let's say we do it  
13           for a week or whatever the window might be.   At the  
14           end of that administration period, the items will be  
15           put on the Web, released to the public along with  
16           scoring guides and other materials that go along with  
17           the test.

18                  The first administration is planned for  
19           1999.

20                  MS. URO:    I have a question about the  
21           national test.   I know the reading is to be in  
22           English, but NAEP now for the first time used the

1       bilingual math test, right, in this last round?

2                   MR. PHILLIPS:   Yes.

3                   MS. URO:   So for this national testing in  
4       math would something like that also be used?   Because  
5       if not, it wouldn't capture those kids.

6                   MR. PHILLIPS:   Inclusion criteria will be  
7       provided and appropriate accommodations will also be  
8       required.   I can't tell you specifically what they  
9       are at the moment because that has to be worked out  
10      as part of the development process.

11                  But the plan is to have appropriate  
12      accommodations.   At the minimum, it would be whatever  
13      the school is willing to provide or what the school  
14      routinely provides and there may be others as well,  
15      that we provide. I'm just not sure.   Like I said, it  
16      has to be worked out as part of the development.

17                  Okay?

18                  MR.   ELFORD:       Does the RFP require  
19      contractor to develop multi-language forms?

20                  MR. PHILLIPS:   No.   I think what it will  
21      do is the issue of what accommodations need to be  
22      provided will be taken up by the contractor.   If in

1 the process it's decided that it might be that in  
2 mathematics there might be a Spanish version  
3 something like that. I'm not saying that's what  
4 we're going to do, but that's a possibility, then  
5 that will have to be developed by the contractor.

6 MR. GORMAN: Let me remind you, George,  
7 please identify yourself and your association for the  
8 record.

9 MS. URO: Gabriela Uro.

10 MR. ELFORD: She asked about actually a  
11 Spanish version, I think.

12 MS. URO: It's a bilingual version, I  
13 understand the latest one that was developed by NAEP.

14 This last round of NAEP -- I'm sorry, the last round  
15 of NAEP testing used for the first time the bilingual  
16 version, where I believe that the test was both in  
17 English and in Spanish.

18 MR. PHILLIPS: That's correct. What we  
19 did in NAEP is we field tested in 1995 two types of -  
20 - one was the Spanish version and one was the  
21 bilingual version and we discovered in the field test  
22 that the students and teachers preferred the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       bilingual version, so that's the one we used in 1996.

2       It had English on the left and Spanish on the right.

3       It worked very well.

4               What we'll do for this test, don't  
5       forget, this is not NAEP. This is a different test  
6       and so those decisions need to be made all over again  
7       for this test.

8               Another important thing too is that with  
9       NAEP one of the reasons why the combination worked so  
10      well is that what we're trying to get at in NAEP is  
11      the overall distribution and providing accommodations  
12      may not change the overall distribution very much,  
13      but it would change individual scores. So we have to  
14      -- we're dealing with the test now in this context as  
15      opposed to NAEP which is a survey. It's a little bit  
16      different. What I'm saying is that everything we've  
17      done in NAEP, that's not automatically applied to  
18      this testing situation. That's one of the things  
19      we need to work through.

20              CHAIRMAN SMITH: It may require, it could  
21      require a Spanish version. That decision has been  
22      made. The commitment here is to have this as

1 inclusive as possible. That's our commitment. There  
2 are constraints on that that exist for a variety of  
3 different reasons, certainly in the short run, less  
4 so in the long run. One of the things we want to do  
5 with this, as Gary will point out, is enable test  
6 publishers to embed this test into their overall  
7 battery of tests. Now depending upon how it's  
8 embedded and how independent it's made by states or  
9 test publishers or others, certain kinds of supports  
10 which provide for inclusiveness can create problems  
11 for the other tests, other assessments. And so we've  
12 got to accommodate that side, while at the same time  
13 using it as a little bit of leverage over time to  
14 have those tests by the publishers and the states to  
15 be more inclusive. So this is a process, I think,  
16 that's going to work greatly to the advantage of  
17 inclusiveness over time.

18 A lot of it quickly, but then there will  
19 be even more gains I think as time goes on, as we  
20 figure out ways to make that -- to make the packages  
21 as embedded as possible and also as inclusive as  
22 possible.

1                   MR. JONES:     Calvin Jones.     Is there  
2     anything in the licensing process to prevent states  
3     or local jurisdictions or any other licensee from  
4     developing their own other language versions?

5                   CHAIRMAN SMITH:   I don't think we faced  
6     that issue.

7                   MR. PHILLIPS:    You mean with the public  
8     released -- yes, that's in the public domain.   You  
9     can do what you want.

10                  CHAIRMAN SMITH:    That's right, these  
11     assessments will be released, May 15th, let's say of  
12     any given year.   The current version is a different  
13     issue and we haven't faced that.

14                  MR. PHILLIPS:    By the way, you asked me  
15     about the Spanish version and I said one thing and  
16     Mike said something slightly different.   This will  
17     happen occasionally because things are going quickly  
18     and as I said, with each meeting we do some tinkering  
19     and that's why the overheads are a little bit  
20     different this time than they were last time and a  
21     little bit different from the time before.

22                                So we're evolving here and so sometimes

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       you might notice that.

2                   CHAIRMAN SMITH:   Based on questions that  
3       have come through.

4                   MR. ELFORD:   George Elford.   In regard to  
5       that question the licensee won't see the test until  
6       the very short window when they give it, isn't that  
7       correct?  They don't get the test in advance.

8                   CHAIRMAN SMITH:   Actually, we hope to  
9       have the licensee see the test --

10                  MR. PHILLIPS:   They'll see it as part of  
11       the training, training for the administration.

12                  MR. ELFORD:   Oh, okay, so we'll see it --

13                  CHAIRMAN SMITH:   What, six months ahead?

14                  MR. PHILLIPS:   Training, I don't know the  
15       details of that.  It's at least three or four months  
16       ahead.

17                  It doesn't mean they get to keep copies  
18       and things like that.  By the way, item security is  
19       going to be a major thrust in this whole activity.  
20       Obviously, people will want to get a look at this  
21       test ahead of time which they can't do.

22                  Okay, other things.   Let's talk about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1     basic design now.     Number one, this test is  
2     voluntary.     It's not being required by the federal  
3     government to be given to any student.     Government is  
4     making this test, the product, service, available to  
5     the educational community and we will do what we can  
6     to make it useful and attractive, but it's voluntary.

7     Now it might be that a state might make it mandatory  
8     or a district, at which point it's mandatory as a  
9     result of action of the district or the state.     It's  
10    not mandatory as a result of action by the  
11    government.

12                 Also, no individually identifiable data  
13    from the test is given back to the federal  
14    government, so we do not collect data from this test  
15    administration.     The data are maintained, kept at the  
16    licensed administrative site which would be like  
17    maybe a test publisher, a state, a district and there  
18    might be others as well.

19                 So we do not get information from states,  
20    districts or schools or regions from this test.     Now  
21    the data that we would have on the test is I think as  
22    part of the norming and the equating process and the

1 technical process, we will be administering the test  
2 to a random sample, smaller random sample than a  
3 national random sample of students and that will  
4 provide us with information about the technical  
5 quality of the test and give us some information  
6 about how students are doing nationally.

7 Those data will be kept confidential. So  
8 that's the only way that we get information on the  
9 test. It's part of the technical norming process of  
10 the test.

11 MR. SNOWHITE: Gary, Larry Snowwhite,  
12 Riverside Publishing. When you say that the test  
13 could be administered by others, would they --

14 MR. PHILLIPS: We haven't nailed down the  
15 licensed groups yet. Obviously include states,  
16 districts and test publishers or other groups still  
17 need to be worked on. That might be it. I don't  
18 know.

19 MR. SNOWHITE: Would a compliance or with  
20 APA standards be the criteria?

21 MR. PHILLIPS: That would certainly be  
22 one of the criteria, but not the only one.

1                   MR. SNOWHITE:    Would the criteria be  
2                   specified by the department, the contractor or the  
3                   department for the contractor?

4                   MR. PHILLIPS:    It will be specified by  
5                   the department, but possibly through another group  
6                   which we haven't nailed down yet either.

7                   MR. SNOWHITE:    Would it be possible for  
8                   the contractor to impose more stringent requirements  
9                   than those set by the department with the department  
10                  giving floor to ceiling guidelines?

11                  MR. PHILLIPS:    As long as it doesn't  
12                  alter the standardization procedure and technical  
13                  quality of the scoring and the validity of the  
14                  inferences from the data.

15                  Okay, the test will be developed and it  
16                  will be used in such a way that it will be consistent  
17                  with the technical standards in the profession.  
18                  These standards are being revised and if that  
19                  revision is available on time, the test will include  
20                  those revised standards.

21                  As I mentioned, inclusive criteria and  
22                  appropriate accommodations will be provided.

1 Individual -- I mention this as individual tests of  
2 reading and math. There will be parallel forms from  
3 year to year which means when we release a form, like  
4 let's say in 1999 after the test administration is  
5 over, we will have already on board a parallel form  
6 which we're preparing for the year 2000. There will  
7 be a released form, but there will also be additional  
8 forms, that we can give to teachers.

9 We intend to record in a metric that can  
10 be easily understood by parents and teachers so it  
11 will have to be something that they intuitively grasp  
12 and that's not difficult for them to understand.

13 MR. ELFORD: I have a question on that  
14 area. George Elford, ACT. That -- the list of  
15 metrics that we've got in the criteria are very  
16 short, is very short.

17 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.

18 MR. ELFORD: Like national percentiles,  
19 calculated grade equivalents, NAEP scale. It seems  
20 to me that that question is not a large, open  
21 question. I think --

22 MR. PHILLIPS: I'm thinking domain

1 scores.

2 MR. ELFORD: Not percent correct?

3 MR. PHILLIPS: It will be like the  
4 percent, it will be like the percent of items, first  
5 year it will be percent correct. The following years  
6 it will be the percent that you would have gotten  
7 correct had you taken that same identical test that  
8 you took in 1999, the base year, something like that.

9 MR. ELFORD: Are you going to do focus  
10 groups or anything with parents? I mentioned it the  
11 other day and I said as a parent that doesn't tell  
12 you anything because you want to know what are the  
13 other kids in the world doing. In other words, if my  
14 kid got 65 percent of the domain, okay that's not --  
15 you know, but if everybody else in the country got 85  
16 percent, I'm worried and if all the rest got 45  
17 percent, hey, my kid's brilliant.

18 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

19 MR. ELFORD: I think this is a problem  
20 that needs to be dealt with in the RFP stage. That's  
21 what I'm getting at. The list is so short, I think  
22 the government should make a decision on which one it

1 will embrace and make sure it's understandable and  
2 not put it off to the contractor.

3 MR. PHILLIPS: I think you're right about  
4 the idea of focus groups. I think that's a real good  
5 idea with parents that look at metrics and see how  
6 well they're understood.

7 But our general feeling up front is that  
8 this needs to be understandable by parents,  
9 intuitively understandable.

10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, right.

11 MR. PHILLIPS: They get a 323, they're  
12 not going to know what that means. They're just not  
13 going to know.

14 MR. ELFORD: And you give them 65  
15 percent, they're not going to know what that means.

16 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right. I think many  
17 parents know what a percent correct means.

18 MR. ELFORD: Not in an effective way.  
19 It's an academic point.

20 MR. PHILLIPS: We'll spend a lot of time  
21 on this issue.

22 MR. ELFORD: I think it should be

1 addressed in the RFP stage rather than put off.

2 MR. PHILLIPS: We'll have to make that  
3 decision.

4 MR. ELFORD: I'm just making --

5 MR. PHILLIPS: I understand.

6 MS. BENNETT: Hi, Linda Bennett. I'd  
7 like to follow up on that in terms of explaining  
8 things to parents and the linkage of from what your  
9 child did on that test to then what's going to happen  
10 in the classroom and what's taught.

11 When a parent gets that information,  
12 that's the critical time to pull in then what is  
13 going to happen in the classroom. That will be  
14 different for my child and also over all the school  
15 and that's the sort of -- you talk about  
16 individualized information, but there's also power in  
17 the sort of collective numbers about that school so  
18 that parents can say wait a minute, there's a problem  
19 here, what are we going to do about it in the  
20 classroom? How is teaching going to change? How is  
21 content, the instruction and what is going to be the  
22 responsibilities in terms of both these licensees,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1        what it means when you voluntarily decide to take on  
2        this test as well as the Department's role in saying  
3        at that crucial time you want it to drive, but then  
4        what is it going to do when you get that test score  
5        to what's taught.

6                    CHAIRMAN SMITH:    There's an interesting  
7        problem here.    The test is really designed to drive  
8        instruction and curriculum before the test is given.  
9        That's absolutely critical to this and along those  
10       lines, I said we're going to have campaigns basically  
11       in math and in reading and we're going to have a Web  
12       page and through the associations and through  
13       parents' magazines and the AARP magazines for  
14       grandparents, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, Urban  
15       League and all that sort of stuff, lists of books  
16       that are appropriate for different ages, kinds of  
17       math problems that kids would be expected to be able  
18       to learn if they're on track to do really well at  
19       different grade levels, ways of thinking about  
20       arithmetic, that parents can talk to their kids  
21       about, etcetera.    Just you name it, any ideas you've  
22       got, we hope will have in the repertoire.    There are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 big efforts going on all across. That's really for K  
2 to 8 in the one part and K to 3 or K to 4. It's also  
3 in early childhood -- there's going to be a big push  
4 in early childhood linking all the stuff we're now  
5 learning about the brain to the kinds of behaviors  
6 that mothers and fathers have toward their children,  
7 talking to them, reading to them, stroking them, all  
8 those things that lead to brain development, that  
9 enables language development and so on.

10 We're also going to have to face the  
11 issue of what do schools do after because now it's  
12 going to be crystal clear. In fourth grade these  
13 kids are going to be faced and they don't succeed to  
14 be able, on the measure, to read independently by the  
15 end of fourth grade or by the end of third grade, or  
16 succeed, that is, on a level that's reasonable for  
17 mathematics in eighth grade.

18 What are schools and districts going to  
19 do and we're going to have to come up and we are,  
20 we're working on it, we're working with the NCTM and  
21 we're working with the IRA and others on strategies  
22 for working with those students and how do you go

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       about -- I don't want to call it remediating, but  
2       working with them in a way that will get them to the  
3       point where they can be successful when they go into  
4       high school in the one case and when they continue in  
5       elementary school in the other case.

6                   The obligation is on our part, the  
7       obligation is on the part of the parents who will  
8       know a lot about this assessment. They'll know more  
9       about this assessment than they've known about any  
10      assessment in the past. They'll have to be deaf to  
11      all the focus that will come in on this. One has to  
12      think about this thing in some ways, think about what  
13      will happen in 1999.

14                   Our expectation is an awful lot of states  
15      and districts are going to sign up for this, that  
16      there will be this big push that we'll make and the  
17      President will continue to make, talk about once or  
18      twice a week. So the whole country is going to know  
19      about this and in many ways that's wonderful and in  
20      other ways we have to figure out how to make it so it  
21      isn't so much pressure on the kids that it's  
22      dysfunctional.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   The wonderful part is that suddenly  
2     parents will be able to say okay, my kid has been  
3     getting reasonable grades all the way along, why  
4     isn't my kid succeeding on this and put the kind of  
5     pressure on school systems that they haven't been  
6     able to put on in the past, that we haven't been able  
7     to generate in the past. And the pressure on those  
8     systems to have to show their scores will be  
9     overwhelming. Newspapers will be asking for scores  
10    by cities and we've got an issue that we're trying to  
11    work through about a turnaround of scores within a  
12    month or so. It's really important because these  
13    things have a half life in some ways.

14                  That's a concern of the publishers is as  
15    you've probably heard. It's also a concern of state  
16    assessments because in the past many publishers and  
17    state assessment systems have not been able to turn  
18    around the scores. They turn them around the next  
19    fall and thereby becoming less useful to parents and  
20    less useful to the school system. They don't have  
21    the summer to work on things. They don't have the  
22    summer to help kids and so on to do well.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   So there's lots of little problems to  
2                   work out, but the overall intent is to have every  
3                   public system that's involved with these kids be  
4                   aware of their responsibility, to help these kids  
5                   both before and after they take the test.

6                   MS. BENNETT: I guess I'm still not clear  
7                   in terms of what is going to be in the RFP or the  
8                   responsibility with the Department in terms of the  
9                   leverages you have with Title I.

10                  CHAIRMAN SMITH: The RFP that's part of  
11                  it. Title I is part of it. IDEA is part of it and  
12                  all of those things, there will be guidance that goes  
13                  out to help Title I teachers teach reading and other  
14                  things, but that's not in the RFP. That won't be in  
15                  the RFP. This RFP is to design and construct the  
16                  test.

17                  MS. BENNETT: I guess what I'm thinking  
18                  is when a parent is getting the information and they  
19                  are in a Title I system, there are handles in that  
20                  Title I about if your child is not reaching the  
21                  standards we've set and say for example we'll presume  
22                  that this test isn't --

1       there's a link, a relationship between the standards  
2       of the state and it's test.

3               Assuming that, then there are some  
4       handles of Title I to say right there what are we  
5       going to do so that your child is taught to high  
6       standards because this is giving us an indicator that  
7       that might be the case.

8               CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's exactly right.

9               MS. BENNETT: And when you're in the  
10       materials that go to it, a parent about the test  
11       score, why can't it be some of their legal handles  
12       and sort of rights to get their kid a quality  
13       education be a part of that?

14              CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, in part because  
15       that's not a test publisher's responsibility to put  
16       that together. It's our responsibility. It's your  
17       responsibility as an advocate. It's the  
18       responsibility of the district. It's the  
19       responsibility of the state. Those are where the  
20       responsibilities lie. I don't want to trip them off.  
21       I don't want to say that this is a responsibility of  
22       the test publisher to do that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BENNETT: But I guess I'm just saying  
2 it's access to information --

3 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, no, I agree.

4 MS. BENNETT: Access. And the Department  
5 prepares something and says here, you can distribute  
6 this with the test information.

7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, we'll distribute it  
8 in other ways. We'll distribute in all sorts of  
9 different ways. We hope that lots of other people  
10 will distribute it too in lots of different ways.

11 You can't put this onus and this  
12 responsibility -- we can't shake off this  
13 responsibility and we're not going to let the  
14 district shake it off or the state.

15 It's not the publisher's responsibility  
16 in this case.

17 MS. KAPIMUS: Barb Kapimus --

18 MR. CONATY: Barbara, you're going to  
19 have to speak up.

20 MS. KAPIMUS: I'm sorry. Listening to  
21 the last two questions and the last discussion, it  
22 seems like it's going to be extremely important both

1       within the RFP and also within the wider context of  
2       how you inform people about the test that you make it  
3       clear to what degree the purpose is to provide  
4       essentially achievement information on kids, how they  
5       read, versus diagnostic information and what are the  
6       vehicles by which you can provide diagnostic  
7       information or ways that people can develop that  
8       diagnostic information without putting the onus on  
9       the test perhaps to provide that information through  
10      perhaps special studies that might be linked to NAEP,  
11      special studies that would be linked to this  
12      assessment, for example, and things like that.

13                   I know listening to this last discussion,  
14      I know parents are going to want to know so if my kid  
15      doesn't achieve up to the standard, what should be  
16      done for that student and it doesn't have to lie  
17      within the test to direct that, but in the process of  
18      developing that, that does need to be looked to and  
19      it does need to be said up front, the degree to which  
20      you're going to do that and how you're going to  
21      handle that.

22                   CHAIRMAN SMITH:  It doesn't like with the

1 test. The test won't be long enough to do -- it  
2 won't have the subscale scores. Besides, most of  
3 these tests don't really diagnose. They'll give an  
4 indicator, but even the very best of the tests don't  
5 have the depth that a decent diagnostician can bring  
6 to just a setting of half an hour with a student.  
7 They use the tests and they use the subscales, but  
8 they also listen to the child read and so on. That  
9 makes all the difference in the world.

10                   There are a couple of things here. We  
11 want to make it very clear to every parent, somehow,  
12 that there are diagnostic strategies and we do have  
13 something valid in teaching reading. We do. There's  
14 been a lot of very good research in teaching reading.

15 It doesn't -- the research doesn't say that it's  
16 either one of two of the biggest camps. There's a  
17 lot in the middle and around and it depends a lot on  
18 understanding by teachers, but there are also some  
19 strategies and skills and understanding in both  
20 diagnosis and regular teaching of reading that makes  
21 a great deal of sense and the parents should expect  
22 from their teachers.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Now, we will put out as good diagnostic  
2     stuff as we possibly can, but it's impossible to  
3     really do diagnosis in the absence of the person  
4     you're diagnosing. You can put out generic stuff and  
5     you can put out information to the parents and the  
6     teachers to ask the right questions. That's what's  
7     really critical. That's again something that -- we  
8     can put that out in 50 different forms and it still  
9     doesn't reach lots and lots of parents, that's where  
10    everybody else comes in. That's why the Department  
11    is not in this alone. Lots of reading partners. We  
12    want lots more reading partners, if possible. The  
13    same thing is true -- we know that teachers read  
14    materials that come from the teacher organizations,  
15    that come from the Phi Delta Kappa, that come from  
16    ASCD. They read those far more quickly than they  
17    read a brochure that might come out of a department.  
18    Parents read things that come from their local  
19    parents' groups and from something that's local to  
20    them and it has direct meaning to them. They don't  
21    read a letter from the Secretary of Education  
22    necessarily that goes into information about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 diagnosis and so on.

2 So we've got to be able to mobilize the  
3 folks that are most salient, the people who we most  
4 want to reach and get information to them so they can  
5 move information beyond that. So it's a multi-step  
6 job and we're all in this together to try to make it  
7 happen.

8 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes?

9 MR. WECKSTEIN: Paul Weckstein from the  
10 Center for Law and Education. I guess looking back a  
11 little bit, I've got a couple of validity questions  
12 both the inclusion criteria and consistency with  
13 professional standards.

14 On the inclusion criteria, will there be  
15 a requirement that indeed the test be validated in  
16 particular populations so in fact we have valid  
17 measures of fourth grade reading performance, eighth  
18 grade math performance or students who have  
19 disabilities, for example, to name one group, so that  
20 it's more than simply good guidance on the inclusion,  
21 but that we actually know we've got a test that is  
22 fairly and accurately measuring their performance.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   My other validity question is validity  
2       for use that has to do with the standards. I know  
3       there's been discussion about encouraging use of  
4       these tests for high stakes purposes for kids,  
5       promotion and graduation. Obviously, for tests to be  
6       used that way they need to be valid for that purpose  
7       which means that kids actually need to have actually  
8       been taught there. I understand we're in the midst  
9       of an effort to try to change that to make that so,  
10      so that kids effectively are taught these subjects,  
11      but obviously we are a long way from being there in  
12      many, many schools and how are we going to deal from  
13      a testing point of view or validity point of view  
14      with use for that purpose in terms of guidance in the  
15      RFP.

16                   MR. PHILLIPS: You asked two questions.  
17      On the first one we -- the first one was on the --  
18      several things. One is we do intend to have an on-  
19      going research component in the testing program and  
20      my assumption is that the first thing we're going to  
21      be looking at would be this very question.

22                   The other thing is that we would include

1 the same inclusion criteria and some accommodations  
2 in the norming process so that would be -- so when we  
3 do this, the norming and the field testing and that  
4 sort of thing, those same kinds of accommodations and  
5 inclusion criteria would be included in that.

6 I don't think we're going to have all the  
7 answers to that question on the first time out, but  
8 it would be -- just like, for example, it is in NAEP,  
9 we've been looking at this issue for NAEP since 1995.  
10 We just completed a major assessment in 1996 and  
11 we're planning to continue it in 1998. And the same  
12 thing would happen in this sort of test program.

13 The question about the validity program  
14 for different uses, we are going to make available a  
15 set of guidelines on the appropriate uses and part of  
16 the responsibility of the contractor is to validate  
17 the test for those uses.

18 Now again it might very well be that  
19 first time out in 1999, we're not going to have all  
20 this resolved. We don't see this as an on-going  
21 thing. The major uses, most appropriate uses, I'm  
22 assuming we would have time to provide validity data

1 on that.

2 MR. WECKSTEIN: The test publisher can't  
3 validate for high stakes purposes because the  
4 validation question there is whether the kids have  
5 been taught. That's not something you can do through  
6 -- and that can only be validated *in situ* in a  
7 particular school. So there has to be some  
8 guidelines on how users can validate in a sense.

9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Part of the answer here  
10 also is, this test will be subject to exactly the  
11 same kinds of criteria as are used for any other test  
12 that goes out from the state or test that comes out  
13 from a publisher, a test that gets constructed by a  
14 local district, so it has to be validated in this  
15 case for high stakes by -- as you said, in the  
16 situation in which it's given and it's clear. We'll  
17 put that out, but it's also clear to everybody who  
18 has begun to think about that sort of thing and begun  
19 to think about using some other tests for it. This  
20 test will have to satisfy the same criteria.

21 MR. PHILLIPS: And again, I think it's  
22 important to know that we can't -- we will not know

1 all answers in 1999. The SAT has been going on for  
2 what, 25 years, and they're still validating the test  
3 for a variety of purposes. So I think this will be  
4 an on-going issue, this test.

5 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm going to have to go.  
6 Does anyone have any questions for me?

7 MR. PHILLIPS: Mike can answer the why  
8 and I can --

9 CHAIRMAN SMITH: So can Joe.

10 MR. PHILLIPS: Joe can answer the why.

11 MR. SNOWWHITE: Larry Snowwhite,  
12 Representing Riverside. The question is going to be  
13 the immediate practical constraints of having tests  
14 administered in 1999 versus the out years and the  
15 question would be what flexibility do you have in the  
16 RFP or will there be flexibility in the RFP to make  
17 differentiations in the first year versus the other  
18 years? Would that be done by bifurcating the RFP, by  
19 doing a different RFP for the first year than for the  
20 other years? Is this conundrum, because I think it  
21 is, accommodatable through the RFP process to  
22 structure the RFP?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   CHAIRMAN SMITH:    It's kind of hard to  
2    talk about that in the abstract.    Do you have a  
3    specific example that you're referring to?

4                   MR. SNOWWHITE:    Again, what would the RFP  
5    say that for the first year permissible uses are X  
6    and Y and then for the out years there may be  
7    additional uses so that the validation can be  
8    facilitated, that the mix of multiple choice and  
9    extended responses might be different in the first  
10   year than in the second year.    You at previously --  
11   prior meetings said that some activities in the first  
12   year will be let through different contractors for  
13   item developments.

14                  CHAIRMAN SMITH:    Clearly, it's the latter  
15   one.   The big break in the uses comes from -- you  
16   make a difference between description and actual use  
17   for some sort of decision.   Then again, you fell back  
18   on the issue of that you can't validate it per se for  
19   that use except in the situation in which you're in  
20   because it implies that students have to be prepared  
21   for the use, prepared to take the test.

22                   I don't know that we're going to make a

1 distinction in the first year.

2 MR. PHILLIPS: Let me tell you what I'm  
3 thinking. It doesn't necessarily mean it's going to  
4 end up in an RFP it still needs to go through an  
5 internal process where we have more discussions, but  
6 the way I see this working as part of the work of the  
7 contractor is to have an on-going resource component  
8 where the consequential validity and other validity  
9 issues associated with the test is researched and  
10 investigated constantly. As new things come up those  
11 are looked at and changes are made accordingly.

12 Now the first year out we cannot have  
13 answers to all those questions, but we do want to  
14 have a set of guidelines on the appropriate use.  
15 Part of the work of the contractor is to get to the  
16 place where we're all comfortable, that the  
17 recommended uses are supported by data and have  
18 empirical support. It might well be that some of the  
19 major uses that we want to have in the future, we may  
20 not be able to be comfortable with in 1999. I don't  
21 know what those are yet, until we work through the  
22 process. But we are committed to providing an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 explicit set of recommended uses that will be backed  
2 up by empirical information at the time and it might  
3 very well be that in the future there will be  
4 additional uses which we want to get to, but until  
5 you have sufficient validity data to justify that,  
6 you may want to hold off.

7 Now what often happens, for example, in a  
8 state assessment and I'm not saying this is going to  
9 happen in this one, but in a state assessment there's  
10 often a year or two of a trial where it's being  
11 given, things like that, and it's checked out and  
12 then after several years, you evolve to the place  
13 where it's used for graduation or whatever. We may  
14 take that approach here. I just don't know. That  
15 has to be decided.

16 But I don't want you to think we're going  
17 to jump out there and say okay, go out and do this,  
18 use this test for this purpose and not have a clue as  
19 to what justification it should have. Again, this is  
20 required not just common sense, but it's also  
21 required by the joint technical standards.

22 So other questions that you're asking

1 about why when Joe Conaty gets here, he'll be able to  
2 answer your questions.

3 MR. CONATY: Or I'll say I don't know.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. PHILLIPS: Why don't I continue with  
6 some of the nuts and bolts here. The NAEP framework  
7 will be used as a blueprint for the development of  
8 the test. That's in both reading and math. Those  
9 frameworks have been developed by the National  
10 Assessment Governing Board through an exhaustive,  
11 extensive national consensus process. They're state  
12 of the art and they're in sync very well with the  
13 content standards that have been developed, the  
14 national content standards so we wanted to use those.

15 Now if at a time in the future the  
16 National Assessment Governing Board decides to revise  
17 those frameworks, then of course this other testing  
18 program would piggyback on that activity.

19 So we will be using a different set of  
20 item and test specifications. Again, this is part of  
21 the contractual work that needs to be done and in  
22 fact, as it turns out this might be something that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       have to do before the RFP is awarded because it may  
2       be difficult, it will be difficult for a contractor  
3       to get out running in September and do all this in  
4       time to pull this off. So this is something that we  
5       might do through another mechanism outside of the RFP  
6       mechanism and if we do that, then what we would do is  
7       we would develop a new set of item test  
8       specifications. Those would be provided to the  
9       contractor for their consideration and those would  
10      then be reviewed and modified or whatever and then  
11      the process would continue, but that work would  
12      already be done by the time a contract was awarded.

13                       We also --

14                       MR. SNOWHITE: Larry Snowwhite, Riverside.  
15       Would the item and test specifications be developed  
16       by the department or would that be another RFP?

17                       MR. PHILLIPS: We haven't got that nailed  
18       down.

19                       MR. CONATY: Gary?

20                       MR. ELFORD: George Elford for ACT. On  
21       this early development, is that contractor also going  
22       to be in line to bid on the main job? On the RFP --

1 MR. PHILLIPS: We don't have --

2 MR. CONATY: That's part of the reason we  
3 don't know yet, George. We haven't worked out how  
4 that might work or whether or not in fact the item  
5 development should be built into this RFP, presuming  
6 that there are pools of existing items. It's a  
7 complicated issue that we have not sorted out yet.

8 MR. PHILLIPS: And let me just show you  
9 clearly why it is that this has come up, why this is  
10 an issue. I'm aware of the schedule problem.

11 MR. CONATY: Does everybody understand  
12 the issue? I think that's one of the questions. In  
13 order to have tests on the street, in order to have  
14 it field tested in time, items have to be developed  
15 that can be tried in a field test to see how well  
16 they work. Given the time constraints, how can we  
17 develop a pool of items that could be used for the  
18 field testing in the initial years given the contract  
19 schedule that the Department works on? There's a  
20 tension in this issue about whether or not you use an  
21 existing contractor, let a new RFP, how do you do  
22 this or do you incorporate it into the existing RFP?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       There is no clear answer to this question yet.

2                   MR. PHILLIPS:   Let me just explain here  
3       so that you understand this a little better.   The  
4       testing cycle for this testing program is a 3-year  
5       assessment cycle, 3-year testing cycle.   So that, for  
6       example, for the year 1999 in the first year items  
7       need to be written, piloted.   The second year field  
8       test is conducted in 1998.   The equating is done, the  
9       linking to NAEP and TIMSS is done and in the final  
10      year the test is actually administered.

11                   The problem is we're awarding a contract  
12      three quarters of the way through this year.   So it's  
13      a problem the first year.   After that it's not a  
14      problem because it will be -- because by the time we  
15      get to 1998, the contract will be awarded and the  
16      item development for the year 2000 can be begin.

17                   For the first year, we don't have that  
18      contract awarded, so therefore the things that need  
19      to get done need to get done, either the contractor  
20      has to hurry up and do that real fast or they need to  
21      get done outside of the contract.   That's what we're  
22      working through now is to what's the best way.   It's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a problem that first year.

2 MR. CONATY: And if anybody has any  
3 thoughts or suggestions on this, please share them  
4 with us.

5 MR. MINCHEW: Daniel Minchew. Have you  
6 asked the potential contractors what their  
7 capabilities are going to be? Would that information  
8 be helpful to you?

9 MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think we've asked  
10 that question, no. We have to first decide  
11 -- there are legal issues and contractual issues and  
12 we're in the middle of this competitive process and  
13 so we're a little bit skittish about having those  
14 kinds of communications, but we do not know that.

15 MR. CONATY: Paul?

16 MR. WECKSTEIN: Paul Weckstein. One  
17 obvious solution that clearly is unacceptable to you  
18 and I'm curious as to why would be to simply push it  
19 back a year, given that you don't have enough of this  
20 year to do it at the kind of pace you're anticipating  
21 for other years and this is the hardest year in some  
22 sense.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Have you -- I know that. It didn't come  
2                   from nature. It came from your --

3                   (laughter.)

4                   MR. WECKSTEIN: -- so I guess I wonder  
5                   given the problem why? Why not push it back a year?

6                   MR. PHILLIPS: This is the reason. It's  
7                   a given.

8                   MR. CONATY: The President has made this  
9                   commitment in the State of the Union address.

10                  MR. WECKSTEIN: I'm now asking why that  
11                  decision was made. What the importance of the year  
12                  1999 is?

13                  MR. CONATY: The President has made this  
14                  commitment.

15                  MR. WECKSTEIN: Does anyone know why?

16                  MR. PHILLIPS: I haven't asked him.

17                  (Laughter.)

18                  MR. CONATY: I think Mike addressed this  
19                  earlier, Paul. I think the issue is concern that the  
20                  progress of reforms and if, in fact, they reached a  
21                  plateau using policy instruments that would move the  
22                  reform, continue to move the reform forward and I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think that was the goal. I know that from the  
2 conversations. Remember, there's an important case  
3 here of the Chicago group that took the TIMSS test  
4 and how they are using it at the local level.

5 And the President was aware of that, went out there  
6 to release the results. I think he saw the power  
7 that these tests can have for local reform.

8 We don't feel this is an insurmountable  
9 problem. We just don't know the best way yet.

10 MR. PHILLIPS: Right. Okay, so the other  
11 things about the test is that it will be linked to  
12 NAEP and TIMSS and that means, for example, in the  
13 case of the reading test there will be a score on the  
14 test, expressed in a metric that's understandable by  
15 parents and teachers and there will be also an  
16 estimated score on NAEP and that's where we also get  
17 the standards, basic, proficient, and advanced. And  
18 that is done technically done -- that will be  
19 transparent to the user. It will be done as part of  
20 the linking contract. There will be four potential  
21 contracts here which I'll get into in just a moment.

22 One of them is a separate linking contract. In the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 case of mathematics, there will be three scores.  
2 There will be the score on the test, an estimated  
3 NAEP score and an estimated TIMSS score and it's from  
4 the TIMSS score that you also get the international  
5 data and the international standards.

6 Yes?

7 MS. McALISTER: Gary, Tammy McAlister  
8 with UTF. With regard to the linking study RFP, will  
9 that cover both the fourth grade and the eighth grade  
10 tests?

11 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

12 MS. McALISTER: There will just be one  
13 linking study?

14 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

15 MS. McALISTER: And in terms of the time  
16 line for that, what is the time line?

17 MR. PHILLIPS: It's about a month later.

18 It's in one of the overheads. The award for the  
19 reading and math development will be September. The  
20 linking study will be in October and the licenses, if  
21 we go with the contractor, that's a big if, it's not  
22 known yet, if we do then it will be awarded in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 November.

2 So the first award will be this fiscal  
3 year. The other awards will be in the next fiscal  
4 year, next federal fiscal year. Okay?

5 Yes.

6 MR. THIEMANN: Gary, Alan Thiemann, NCTB.  
7 You had a chart a minute ago when you were talking  
8 about the three year cycle. There seems to be a  
9 basic change on the one you have and the one that was  
10 handed out even though the data are the same and it  
11 relates to the linkage issues because on the one that  
12 was handed out, it's NAEP/reading and here it's  
13 NAEP/National Teachers Reading. Are we adding new  
14 standards in here and then you've got NTM, National  
15 Teachers of Mathematics, I assume instead of math.

16 MR. PHILLIPS: No, that's not national.  
17 See, the acronym I choose causes this confusion. I  
18 did have National Reading Tests, NRT and of course,  
19 that gets confused with the Norm Refernced Test.  
20 What we're referring to here is the National Test in  
21 Reading, National Test in Mathematics. Okay?

22 MR. THIEMANN: Thanks.

1                   MR. JONES: Gary, Calvin Jones. Will  
2                   there be any proscriptions on the awards to a single  
3                   contractor, for example, for all four contracts?

4                   MR. PHILLIPS: I don't believe so. I'd  
5                   have to check with --

6                   MR. JONES: No conflicts you imagine?

7                   MR. PHILLIPS: The question was is it  
8                   possible that one company could get all the  
9                   contracts.

                  MR. GORMAN: Steve Gorman from  
10                  NCBS. We had talked about at the last public  
11                  meeting, about there being a possible conflict, the  
12                  development contractor was also the be the licensee -  
13                  -

14                  MR. PHILLIPS: That we won't do. We  
15                  don't want to have the license contract be the same  
16                  as the development contract, but if you were asking  
17                  if the same company be awarded a contract to do  
18                  reading and math, the answer varies. That's the  
19                  first part.

20                  Okay. Back to the basic design, we're  
21                  winding down here. We'd like to have the test be up  
22                  to about 90 minutes in testing time. That's about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 twice what we have with NAEP. It's very similar to  
2 what the testing time was with the TIMSS assessment.

3 When I say NAEP, I'm talking about the time you  
4 spend on the achievement items.

5 Now, it's an empirical question of how  
6 much we can report with that amount of test  
7 information. If we can get down into the subtest  
8 score we will we can't and won't and there's no  
9 guarantee at this point, we're not planning to do  
10 something to get down to that point. So at this  
11 point we'd like to get an overall estimate of  
12 achievement in mathematics and in reading.

13 Approximately 80 percent of the test  
14 items will be multiple choice, 20 percent will be  
15 constructed-response that will include one extended  
16 constructed-response. We think that means that half  
17 of the student's testing time will be spent on the  
18 constructed-response item.

19 There will be this on-going research  
20 component we talked about earlier. One of the very  
21 first things we're going to look at is the students -  
22 - the validity question on the students with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 disabilities and LEP students. There are other  
2 interests too which will be concepts discussed or  
3 mentioned in the RFP, but they're not at this point a  
4 commitment to do them, for example, we'd like to have  
5 a research component that moves us in the direction  
6 of more of a computer environment, somewhere down the  
7 road. Starting out, it will not be this focus

8 Three year assessment cycle I mentioned  
9 earlier, let me just say one other thing about the  
10 assessment cycle, once the testing program gets  
11 started, it will be on a routine cycle. For example,  
12 in the year 1999 we will be administering the 1999  
13 assessment. Simultaneously we'll be field testing  
14 the forms in preparation for the year 2000 and  
15 developing items and piloting those in preparation  
16 for the year 2001 and every year we're doing the same  
17 thing. Each assessment takes three years to  
18 development and then each year three assessments are  
19 being developed.

20 MR. ELFORD: These are calendar years?

21 MR. PHILLIPS: Calendar years, yes.

22 MR. ELFORD: George Elford, ACT. You

1 mentioned a computer environment. Is there going to  
2 be mention of that in the RFP in other words, would  
3 the contractor be addressing that some way in the  
4 RFP?

5 MR. PHILLIPS: There will be a list of  
6 potential research priorities, but that's not  
7 intended to be a decision. It's intended to be for  
8 the consideration of the contractor and also the  
9 general consensus process. With each contractor,  
10 there's going to be an overall advisory group and  
11 there will also be an overall technical group  
12 advising the contractor and we want many of these  
13 things to have  
14 -- to be discussed in an open forum with a national  
15 consensus as much as possible, having an impact on  
16 what we're doing. So we don't want to specify all  
17 the research activities up front. We want those  
18 things to percolate for a while. But I can tell you  
19 right away that the first one out is going to be the  
20 issue of the validity of the test for SD and LEP  
21 students. But there may be others as well, beyond  
22 that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Yes?

2 MS. OSAJIMA: April Osajima with the  
3 American Association of University Women. I just  
4 want to go back to a question for a second about  
5 whether the RFP will require validation for specific  
6 populations? I hear that research will be on-going  
7 for LEP and students with disabilities, but what  
8 about gender and race, will that be required in the  
9 RFP for the first year?

10 MR. PHILLIPS: A good guide on this is to  
11 look at the joint technical standards and so whatever  
12 is the recommendation there which Joe is reminding me  
13 it is part of the recommendation in the joint  
14 technical standards, that's what we would be asking  
15 the contractor to do.

16 MR. CONATY: The standards will come out  
17 and say that tests have to be free of gender bias and  
18 the case of performance based tests that the task  
19 itself elicits the response will also have to be free  
20 of gender bias.

21 MR. PHILLIPS: And part of the routine  
22 test development procedure that you use is to do

1 something called differential item function where  
2 you're looking at gender differences, race and  
3 ethnicity differences and other differences. You  
4 look at empirical data as part of the decision that  
5 you make as to whether or not an item is biased.

6 That's part of the routine development of  
7 the assessment. That will be in the RFP.

8 MR. CONATY: And many of the commercial  
9 test publishers do all of this all the time anyway.  
10 they have made important efforts to rid tests of  
11 these issues.

12 MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, other things you  
13 need to know about is the administration of scoring  
14 analysis and recording. These will be conducted by a  
15 licensed site. It might be a state. It might be a  
16 school district, a publisher or other group which I'm  
17 not sure what it will be yet. It still needs to be  
18 worked out.

19 The first administration is planned for  
20 April of 1999. The administration will be carried  
21 out by licensed test administrators. We would like  
22 to have a random sample of licensed test sites that

1 would be monitored so that we can assure the public  
2 and government that everyone is following the rules  
3 and that things are going fine.

4 During the first year of administration,  
5 I'm sorry --

6 MR. WECKSTEIN: On the monitoring,  
7 there's monitoring to make sure that the test  
8 administration is proper and I assume that's the main  
9 focus of that statement. But another critical  
10 question here, giving the purpose of the test, is the  
11 impact on instruction of the test. I was just at a  
12 school last week, one of many schools in this  
13 particular district where the focus was on the norm-  
14 referenced test that the school was going to be  
15 administered in. That was the name of the game  
16 throughout the school. there may be positive  
17 impacts. There may be negative impacts, etcetera.  
18 Is that going to be part of the monitoring?

19 MR. PHILLIPS: The monitoring might end  
20 up feeding into that. That's going to be part of the  
21 validation process and the research component and for  
22 example, in NAEP we often use data from the

1 monitoring as information to feed in to other  
2 research questions, so that might happen there.

3 In my thinking, that's not what I mean by  
4 monitoring. What I mean by monitoring is to  
5 guarantee that the administration is being followed,  
6 scoring is being done according to the guidelines,  
7 the training is being carried off as it should be,  
8 things like that. In the process of doing that, the  
9 monitor often collect information that could be used  
10 for a variety of purposes, transcript data could be  
11 looked at, all sorts of things. That has to get  
12 worked out in detail by the contractor.

13 MR. MINCHEW: I guess what I'm suggesting  
14 as a major recommendation is that some real resources  
15 go into a conscious effort to monitor around the  
16 country the actual impact on instructional practices  
17 because we know from other research funded by the  
18 department that, including the Center on Organization  
19 and Restructuring the Schools that instructional  
20 practice can have a big impact on NAEP performance,  
21 specifically, but that the way you do it is by doing  
22 anything but concentrating on passing NAEP. It's very

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 different kinds of assessment processes that are part  
2 of instruction. Whether this use of NAEP promotes or  
3 retards data, I think is a critical question and  
4 should be part of this effort.

5 MR. PHILLIPS: Very good point. Very  
6 good point. Another important piece here is that  
7 during the first year of administration, the  
8 contractor -- I need to change that -- either the  
9 contractor or the government through some mechanism  
10 will reimburse the licensees for the costs of  
11 conducting and scoring the assessments. That might  
12 get extended for another year or more, depending on  
13 the decisions made by the White House and others in  
14 Congress. But the commitment now is to reimburse,  
15 provide the reimbursement during the first year which  
16 is 1999.

17 MR. MINCHEW: Gary, this issue came up at  
18 least in one of the other sessions and let me ask,  
19 have you ruled out the possibility of having an  
20 independent entity do the scoring?

21 MR. PHILLIPS: No, we have not ruled out  
22 that possibility.

1                   MR. MINCHEW: But you just said that the  
2 contract would reimburse the scoring?

3                   MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, what do you mean by  
4 -- what I thought you were saying is that we might  
5 have a number of licensed scorers and then a -- if a  
6 district wants to go to that licensed scorer, they  
7 could go to any number of them, but it has to be a  
8 licensed scorer and then through competitive process  
9 or through a contractual arrangement, that license  
10 scorer could do those scoring for that district. Is  
11 that what you mean?

12                  MR. MINCHEW: The contractor would then  
13 reimburse one of the licensed scorers.

14                  MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, yes.

15                  MR. SNOWWHITE: Gary, Larry Snowwhite,  
16 Riverside. There are lots of functions within the  
17 administration of scoring, analysis reporting,  
18 monitoring, etcetera. What I think I just heard is  
19 that there could be licensed sites where the test  
20 will be administered and there could be licensed  
21 scorers --

22                  MR. PHILLIPS: There could be. I'm not

1 saying there will be, but there could be.

2 MR. SNOWHITE: Would that be specified  
3 structurally in the RFP or would that be something  
4 that a contractor would be proposing? How much  
5 flexibility does the contractor, could the contractor  
6 have in structuring the administrative elements  
7 through licenses?

8 MR. PHILLIPS: The current plan is to get  
9 that nailed down by the time the RFP is on the  
10 street. If we don't get that nailed down then it  
11 will have to be taken up as part of that process.

12 MR. CONATY: Adina?

13 MS. KOLE: I was just going to add that  
14 Gary is talking about --

15 MR. CONATY: Introduce yourself.

16 MS. KOLE: Adina Kole from the Education  
17 Department. Gary is talking about the licensing RFP,  
18 not the development RFP.

19 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.

20 MS. KOLE: Just in terms of timing.  
21 That's going to be a little bit later and that would  
22 follow after the linking study RFP.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. PHILLIPS:     Right.     But you were  
2     asking about the development RFP?

3                   MR. SNOWWHITE:   Yes.

4                   MS. KOLE:    Oh, you were?

5                   MR. PHILLIPS:   The question is how much  
6     of that is going to be in the development RFP.

7                   MS. KOLE:    Okay, not much.

8                   MR. PHILLIPS:     Right,    there's your  
9     answer.

10                  MS. KOLE:    We're separating the license  
11     RFP -- the license RFP is probably the vehicle that  
12     will talk about those kinds of issues.

13                  MR. PHILLIPS:   In a prior meeting than  
14     you attended, at that point we were thinking about  
15     having the license as a part of the development. And  
16     we decided that was not a good idea and so we're now  
17     rethinking that and where we don't have it quite  
18     nailed down yet. There are lots of things related --

19                  MR. SNOWWHITE:   So then it will be whoever  
20     gets the contract to supervise or develop the  
21     licensing would they then make a determination as to  
22     whether the administration scoring analysis and maybe

1 reporting would be done by separate entities with the  
2 license or is that all going to be at the discretion  
3 of the site license?

4 MR. PHILLIPS: I think you're asking more  
5 questions than I can answer at the moment.

6 MS. KOLE: We'll work that out. We're  
7 not sure yet.

8 MR. CONATY: Each time we have one of  
9 these meetings, people have raised these wonderful  
10 issues for us and it takes us some time to figure out  
11 the legal contractual and policy implications of the  
12 alternatives you present to us.

13 MR. PHILLIPS: There are three big --

14 MR. CONATY: That's why we're doing this.

15 MR. PHILLIPS: There are three big issues  
16 here related to the licensing. One is who issues the  
17 license. And how are they monitored and how does  
18 reimbursement work? Those are things that we need to  
19 get nailed down.

20 MR. SNOWHITE: And for a license for  
21 what?

22 MR. PHILLIPS: Right, exactly. Which

1 functions.

2 MS. McALISTER: Tammy McAlister, ETS. I  
3 just want to make sure I understood what you just  
4 said to clarify this because last week you were  
5 thinking of three RFPs.

6 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.

7 MS. McALISTER: So today you are thinking  
8 of four RFPs?

9 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.

10 MS. McALISTER: One for development, one  
11 for licensing -- well, two for development, one for  
12 licensing and one for linking.

13 MR. PHILLIPS: Right. We always thought  
14 of three, but as a result of these meetings, it  
15 became real clear that the idea of having the license  
16 as part of the development was not a good idea.

17 MS. McALISTER: Okay.

18 MR. PHILLIPS: So we now have four. The  
19 licensing is an issue that we're -- that is less  
20 settled than the others. The linking is pretty well  
21 nailed down. The development is pretty well nailed  
22 down. We have answers to lots of those questions.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But because this just came up with the licensing, we  
2 don't quite have those questions nailed down yet.  
3 We've got the questions nailed down. We don't have  
4 the answers nailed down.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. PHILLIPS: Okay?

7 Okay, the other thing about the  
8 administration is that it will be consistent with all  
9 civil rights laws and IDEA and other federal laws and  
10 the test reporting strategies will be local options.

11 Although we are likely to have guidelines as part of  
12 the licensing process about certain types of  
13 reporting that are appropriate and certain types that  
14 are not.

15 Yes?

16 MR. ELFORD: George Elford, ACT. On the  
17 voluntary issue, you mentioned references to that and  
18 I was a little bit confused today. You don't  
19 envision a circumstances where a school would make it  
20 voluntary for the students whether they want to take  
21 it or not?

22 MR. PHILLIPS: I think they should.

1                   MR. ELFORD: So the inclusion in all that  
2 would not apply to the schools, whoever wants to take  
3 it can take it.

4                   MR. PHILLIPS: Well, again, you're asking  
5 me a question before we've done the work, but the  
6 general idea here is this is a flexible thing, its  
7 provided to --

8                   MR. ELFORD: See, my prior understanding  
9 was if the school decided to take part, they have to  
10 follow all the rules of inclusion.

11                  MR. PHILLIPS: That's correct.

12                  MR. ELFORD: So it can't be voluntary for  
13 the students to opt in or out.

14                  MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, I see what you're  
15 saying.

16                  MR. ELFORD: The voluntariness comes to  
17 the agency, to the school district or school, but not  
18 to the individual participants.

19                  MR. PHILLIPS: That I'm not sure I have an  
20 answer to. All I can say at this point is that  
21 whatever the requirements are it must be, the  
22 administration must be done within those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requirements. Now I don't -- I'm not sure about this  
2 particular one.

3 MR. MINCHEW: Daniel Minchew, ACT. Let  
4 me follow up on George's concerns. It was my  
5 understanding in earlier meetings that for a district  
6 to participate, it was a voluntary decision.

7 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.

8 MR. MINCHEW: But once a district had  
9 decided to participate, all students in fourth grade  
10 and all students in eighth grade would be  
11 administered the test and am I hearing now that you  
12 are rethinking that?

13 MR. CONATY: No. At this point I could  
14 only use NAEP as an model. In most districts, when a  
15 district agrees, or a state or a school, the school  
16 has two options. One is you can have implicit  
17 agreement with the parent or explicit agreement. In  
18 the case of implicit agreement, parents are sent a  
19 note that says something like your children will  
20 participate and unless I hear otherwise there will be  
21 an assessment. In some schools and districts they  
22 don't want that. They want to say no. You can't be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in assessment until you write back and tell me they  
2 can be in the assessment.

3 Now those are local decisions. I don't  
4 think they're decisions that we're going to make. So  
5 -- I do not know how this will play out in the  
6 context of this test.

7 MR. MINCHEW: But could you envision a  
8 circumstance where in a district only the best and  
9 brightest were encouraged?

10 MR. CONATY: No.

11 MR. MINCHEW: Could you envision a  
12 circumstance where students who might not be so  
13 strong would --

14 MR. CONATY: I'm going to be frank. You  
15 know better. You know that schools have local  
16 guidelines now for the participation in the tests  
17 that you sell and that you administer.

18 There's nothing in this test that would  
19 encourage people to use different behaviors than the  
20 behaviors that they currently find. This is just  
21 like any other test. It's like the norm reference  
22 test, the state test, the district tests.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ELFORD: George Elford --

2 MR. CONATY: Except your first line says  
3 the test is voluntary. Those other tests are not  
4 voluntary tests. Those are school administered  
5 tests. They're never described as voluntary to  
6 anybody. It's school business. That's what it is.

7 MR. ELFORD: And you know in some of  
8 those cases some students do not participate --

9 MR. CONATY: I know that.

10 MR. ELFORD: And schools have such rules  
11 for that sort of participation.

12 MR. CONATY: I know that.

13 MR. PHILLIPS: See and that's why --

14 MR. ELFORD: That's not voluntary. The  
15 school manages that.

16 MR. PHILLIPS: But this is also why we  
17 don't, we get no data back. The information we get  
18 back is the report that the district provides or the  
19 state. So we get it just like anybody else. So we,  
20 the government, federal government, will not rely on  
21 this for like accountability information or  
22 monitoring, things like that. There will be some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       national data that we collect for that purpose, but  
2       there will not be -- it's not like -- we will still  
3       rely on NAEP for the state data, for example.

4               MR. MINCHEW:   But the department will be  
5       encouraging wide participation.

6               MR. CONATY:   Yes, absolutely.

7               MR. PHILLIPS:   Yes.

8               MR. SNOWHITE:   Larry Snowwhite, Riverside.  
9       Will this implicit/explicit rule apply also to field  
10      testing?

11              MR. PHILLIPS:   That was the rule we used  
12      at NAEP. I didn't say that's the rule we're going to  
13      have here. Use that as an example of how this issue  
14      is dealt with at NAEP. I don't yet know how that will  
15      be dealt with in this assessment.

16              MR. SNOWHITE:   Would this be clarified or  
17      explicit in the RFP or would this be up to the  
18      contractor or the licensee as far as any potential  
19      for opting in or out?

20              MR. PHILLIPS:   I haven't checked the RFP  
21      on this issue. I'm assuming it will be done as part  
22      of the RFP.

1 MR. SNOWHITE: The question of once --

2 MR. PHILLIPS: With the limits suggested  
3 by the government. Our interests, the government's  
4 interests is to make sure that it's a level playing  
5 field and the test is used appropriately and  
6 inferences that are drawn are appropriate inferences  
7 and so to the extent that the test could be used in  
8 ways that are counter to that, we would step in and  
9 do whatever needed to be done to guarantee to  
10 everybody that there's a level playing field.

11 MR. CONATY: And Larry, I want to remind  
12 you, this is an extraordinary situation to have these  
13 meetings prior to the issuance of an RFP to get  
14 public comment on initial thinking and initial design  
15 issues for a contract. As you know, this is not the  
16 typical way. There is so much interest in doing this  
17 right and in doing this in ways that respond to the  
18 public and doing this, that that is the reason for  
19 these extraordinary efforts. Even the publication of  
20 the draft RFP, it's not -- it's considered of such  
21 importance and visibility that we want to do this  
22 absolutely right with the most input we can get.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. KOLE: And I just wanted to add that  
2 we will make sure that there will be inclusion  
3 criteria that will be set out, that will be  
4 implemented by the contractor to insure that we don't  
5 have a scenario like you're talking about here with  
6 the high achievers taking the test and all the  
7 disabled kids being left in a room somewhere. That's  
8 just not going to happen.

9 MR. CONATY: And as the draft RFP is put  
10 up, there will be another opportunity to raise these  
11 issues again if people still have concerns.

12 MR. MINCHEW: Daniel Minchew, ACT. I  
13 applaud the department's openness on this and I hope  
14 that this will be a model for other big contracts as  
15 well, but we heard Helen say that the draft is going  
16 to be up, but she did not say when it would be up.  
17 Can you give us an idea of when we should find it?  
18 She also said that there would be a pre-solicitation  
19 meeting as well. Will there be a pre-bid meeting  
20 after the solicitation is issued? Those are my three  
21 questions.

22 MR. PHILLIPS: We might be like a week

1 off, but the plan is to have the draft statement of  
2 work in mid-March, so that's about in a week or so.  
3 The pre-solicitation conference would be shortly  
4 after that. This might be off -- this is - we're off  
5 by a week or so, maybe two weeks. So let's say we  
6 have the RFP on the Web the end of next week. After  
7 a period of time, a week or so after that, we would  
8 have pre-solicitation conference.

9 We don't currently have in the plans a  
10 formal bidders conference. We might add one. So  
11 that's where we are right now.

12 In answer to your first question, end of  
13 next week or the beginning of the following week.

14 MR. ELFORD: Would the -- the other major  
15 -- the linking contract is pretty well -- are you  
16 going to put the other contracts -- George Elford,  
17 ACT -- the other contracts out for publicity before  
18 issue, like the licensing contract which is a big  
19 one.

20 MR. PHILLIPS: I need to talk to Helen  
21 about that. I don't know.

22 MR. ELFORD: That's usually done when you

1 have it all in one contract.

2 MR. PHILLIPS: Right, exactly.

3 MR. ELFORD: So my question is --

4 MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know the answer.

5 MR. WECKSTEIN: Some of the questions  
6 which just came up a few minutes ago seem to me to go  
7 to the licensing agreement in terms of how the test  
8 is used and I would also suggest how it's reported.  
9 I think, it seems to me, there needs to be some  
10 balance between local flexibility and what they  
11 report and some agreement that make the departments  
12 doing this to carry out a certain mission, a license  
13 should be drawn up with that and part of what ought  
14 to get reported is who is taking the test and who is  
15 not in order to serve the purpose of insuring this  
16 affects all kids.

17 Are those things going to be -- those  
18 pieces of the licensing contracts, are those going to  
19 be developed by the contractor for the licenses or by  
20 the department or is that something --

21 MS. KOLE: It's a work in process.

22 MR. WECKSTEIN: Okay.

1 MS. KOLE: I'm curious though. What do  
2 you think would be a better way?

3 MR. WECKSTEIN: Well, perhaps an  
4 iterative process, the department needs, based on  
5 public input, to lay out some clear parameters as to  
6 certain elements of the license and I don't know  
7 about your person power and I don't have a suggestion  
8 as to the precise balance as to what the licensing  
9 contractor does, but then some of that should then  
10 come back for further discussion and input, it seems  
11 to me.

12 MR. PHILLIPS: I think I basically  
13 covered -- oh, it me say one other thing. There is a  
14 Web address which is this:  
15 *http://www.ed.gov/updates/EDMaterial/* and this will  
16 get you to the materials we have on this issue at the  
17 moment.

18 We are going to be changing the Web  
19 address so it's more recognizable. It will probably  
20 say something like *www.ed.gov/national test*,  
21 something like that. Right now until we get that set  
22 up, this contains all the information. This is part

1 of the Department of Education Web site.

2 Also, this may be made into a White House  
3 Web site in the future, but that needs to be worked  
4 through. I understand shortly there will be the  
5 first set of minutes from the first meeting and then  
6 those will come, each one will come after that, like  
7 a week apart. Right now if you go to the Web site  
8 you should have materials that were handed out by the  
9 White House prior to the President's speech, State of  
10 the Union, the press release and it should be there  
11 and there might be some other things.

12 MR. SNOWHITE: Technical specifications  
13 are there.

14 MR. PHILLIPS: Which would be the first  
15 iteration of what you saw today. So -- and we plan  
16 to put everything there. The RFP will be there. If  
17 we have other RFPs like the linking and the licenses,  
18 those will be there, if we do that. I'm not sure we  
19 will. But whatever we have, that's one place where  
20 anybody can go to get everything that's publicly  
21 available on the testing issue.

22 Other questions? I've basically finished

1        what I have to say. We still do have time.

2                    MS. KOLE:        What about any other  
3        suggestions people might have. You have been sitting  
4        here thinking about this and listening. We'd be  
5        interested in listening to ideas you may have, what  
6        you might think might be best implemented, not just a  
7        question and answer type thing.

8                    MR. MINCHEW:    Daniel Minchew, ACT. I  
9        think you made a terrific decision in splitting the  
10       licensing contract because that was giving people a  
11       lot of problems. We appreciate your reaction to the  
12       earlier meetings.

13                   MS. KAPIMUS:    Barb Kapimus. When the  
14       question arose about iteming tests back and the  
15       challenge of having something developed too quickly,  
16       if you hit the ground running, I didn't hear you talk  
17       about really dipping into the current information  
18       that you have already on the current made items. You  
19       might do that because it seems there's an awful lot  
20       of information about how the items work, what kinds  
21       of items work and probably could also tap groups of  
22       people who fit in literally, instead of looking at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       those items, both in anchor paper selection, and also  
2       with the anchoring process.     So looking at the  
3       connection between the items and the assessments  
4       which you want to be able to say about students to  
5       take which items work best, doing that and so forth.

6       It just seems to me that that would make a lot of  
7       sense.

8                     MR. PHILLIPS:     It does make a lot of  
9       sense.

10                    MS. KAPIMUS:     To use that information,  
11       out there.

12                    MR. PHILLIPS:     I agree and that will be  
13       used, but what we want to do is to get all that  
14       information that's available and it's good  
15       information.  We'll use all of it, but we want to get  
16       to the point of being closer to knowing what the item  
17       test specs are for this test.  We know what it is for  
18       NAEP.  All that information is available.  It will be  
19       used and it might very well be that the  
20       specifications for this test are a modification of  
21       the ones that we had for NAEP, but we were hoping to  
22       get to know more about that before we get to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       September.    I really don't want the contractor to  
2       just suddenly have to do all this because we have to  
3       get test specifications developed before we can get  
4       items written.   We can't do any item work until we  
5       know what the test specifications are and item  
6       specifications.    So what we'd like to do, if  
7       possible,   prior to September is to get the  
8       specifications and a draft set of items, if possible,  
9       but that would, in part, depend on whether or not  
10      there's a way of getting it done in this short time.

11      It might be that we can or it might be that we  
12      can't.   If we can get it done, then it will have to  
13      be dealt with as part of the contractual obligations  
14      of the bidders.

15                   MR. CONATY:   Barbara, I think also it's  
16      important to remember that the public release of the  
17      test shortly after its administration so that people  
18      can use it for a variety of other purposes to help  
19      drive instructional change and all of those other  
20      issues you raised means that item development, item  
21      specs will be an on-going issue, vis-à-vis, the  
22      tests, so that the kinds of items that you use are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not only reliable, valid as items, but are also  
2 linked to important issues of instruction and  
3 practice and so on, so the thing you have to be  
4 careful of is the public release, you don't want to  
5 interfere with the integrity of NAEP and the  
6 development of this process because you want NAEP to  
7 continue to serve its long-term historic functions  
8 while you run this test. So there are tensions to  
9 the extent to which you can do that.

10 MS. KAPIMUS: Yes. I understand the need  
11 to sort of make the differentiation between the two,  
12 but on the other hand, I think there's ways to help  
13 speed up that process.

14 MR. CONATY: I agree.

15 MS. KAPIMUS: You can still question the  
16 current sort of NAEP information about it within a  
17 context of if we had a different kind of assessment,  
18 if we were going to do it this way, what kinds of  
19 items need to work and actually the public release  
20 thing I think is another question because some of  
21 the, for example, personal response items in reading  
22 are clearly items that would have to be carefully

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sort of re-examined in terms of whether those kinds  
2 of items could even be considered at all and to what  
3 degree and how do you take care of that kind of  
4 thing. So I agree, but again I think that you can  
5 look at what some of the public really got from NAEP  
6 and there's a lot of good direction there.

7 MR. CONATY: I think the public release  
8 part was an important proviso. That was what I was  
9 concerned about. I did want others to think you meant  
10 want to reach into the existing NAEP and use those  
11 items as is.

12 MR. MINCHEW: Daniel Minchew, ACT. What  
13 thought have you given to accommodate home schooling?

14 MR. PHILLIPS: First of all, when the  
15 items are available on the Web, along with scoring  
16 guides that obviously is a good situation.

17 MR. MINCHEW: That's a year later. Would  
18 there be some possibility for home schooling --

19 MS. KOLE: It's a week later.

20 MR. PHILLIPS: It's a week later.

21 MS. KOLE: Then it will be on the Web.

22 MR. PHILLIPS: If there's a window at the

1 end of that, it's available.

2 MR. MINCHEW: But you're not anticipating  
3 an accommodation for home schoolers to take the test  
4 at a licensed site?

5 MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know the answer to  
6 that.

7 MS. KOLE: That's a possibility. I think  
8 it might work. This is structured in such a way  
9 where there will be an individual report to the  
10 parent and a report to schools and theoretically so  
11 the school could have the sense of what the kids are  
12 doing, but I guess home school --

13 MR. MINCHEW: They're making it  
14 interesting research.

15 MS. KOLE: You're right.

16 MR. MINCHEW: If you could pool all of  
17 the home schoolers nationally.

18 MS. KOLE: They may want to do that.  
19 That may be something --

20 MR. PHILLIPS: Then they have to  
21 demonstrate that they have the capacity and the  
22 capability to follow the administrative procedures

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and get the scoring done and things like that.

2 MR. MINCHEW: I was not suggesting that  
3 home schoolers be a licensed site, but a student who  
4 was home schooled, my question was would that  
5 student, would it be possible for that student to be  
6 accommodated in a regular license site.

7 MR. PHILLIPS: I see, as an  
8 accommodation. MS. KOLE: Maybe. There  
9 maybe a home school association might be interested  
10 in becoming a licensee. That's something that we'll  
11 have to be flexible about.

12 MR. PHILLIPS: There are many issues like  
13 private schools and other things that we're dealing  
14 with and we need to get them nailed down.

15 MR. JONES: Calvin Jones again. Can you  
16 say anything more about your thinking about the  
17 content of the licensing contract, what activities  
18 would be included there, in particular since this  
19 program succeeds the extent that it becomes more and  
20 more universal, are there any marketing functions  
21 that would be included in any of these contracts? Is  
22 that all departmental functions?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. PHILLIPS: I can say with confidence  
2 we don't have that nailed down at this point.

3                   (Laughter.)

4                   MR. PHILLIPS: There are lots of issues.  
5       Once we made the decision to take the licensing part  
6 out of the development part, this has become a whole  
7 other set of things now that need to be dealt with  
8 that we didn't think we had to deal with there and I  
9 think it was the right decision and I'm glad we made  
10 that, but there are many issues surrounding the  
11 licensing. I think saying any more, I'd be going  
12 beyond what I know at this point.

13                  MR. MINCHEW: Daniel Minchew, ACT. I'm  
14 reminded of one other question. You indicated that  
15 the eighth grade is going to be tied to NAEP and  
16 TIMSS and there is a discussion out on the Net that  
17 maybe you've decided to drop TIMSS and there was some  
18 report to one --.

19                  MR. PHILLIPS: An Internet rumor.

20                  (Laughter.)

21                  MR. PHILLIPS: No, what we decided, we  
22 started out thinking that we would have the framework

1       where the eighth grade math be the TIMSS framework,  
2       again, as a result of meetings like this and in fact,  
3       this was a meeting of the technical group that we had  
4       in. We became convinced that it's probably a better  
5       idea to attach this test to the NAEP framework, which  
6       is more national in scope. TIMSS is a more  
7       international framework, but we're not giving up on  
8       the link to TIMSS and international standards that it  
9       provides. It just is that the framework would be,  
10      the NAEP framework is the TIMSS framework.

11                   MR. THIEMANN: Gary, Alan Thiemann. Will  
12      the transcript of that technical meeting be released?

13                   MR. CONATY: Yes, that's the one. We  
14      have it back. We have it back and the person that's  
15      putting it up was out yesterday, so that's why it's  
16      not up, now, but it will be in a day or two, Alan.

17                   Yes?

18                   MR. WECKSTEIN: Paul Weckstein. I just  
19      want to come back, I guess, something Mike said  
20      earlier about powerful campaigns between now and 1999  
21      to insure all students are enabled to meet these  
22      standards and I understand that one piece of it is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1        what was announced in the State of the Union in terms  
2        of tutoring and Mike talked about that. Obviously,  
3        that in and of itself isn't particularly aimed at  
4        changing instruction in schools in reading and math,  
5        which is obviously very central to whether kids learn  
6        or not and there was a passing reference to Title I  
7        and I guess I'm wondering about the department's view  
8        of the role of Title I in this but also  
9        administratively how this is all working. There's a  
10       group that's focused now and obviously the focus of  
11       this meeting, by and large, is on development of the  
12       test, who's dealing with these campaigns and how does  
13       all that work. Are there dollar resources that are  
14       going to go into the latter?

15                    MR. PHILLIPS: That's you, Joe.

16                    MR. CONATY: Paul, there are a set of  
17       task forces around each of the priorities that the  
18       President announced. The resource question, I don't  
19       think has clearly been addressed yet. It's an issue  
20       of leverage right now.

21                    MR. WECKSTEIN: None of those priorities  
22       went to -- unless I'm missing something, changing

1 instructional practices within schools, so is the  
2 answer that that's not going to be a focus of any  
3 campaign to enable kids to meet these things --

4 MR. CONATY: Paul, I don't know how to  
5 answer that. I'm not sure. I think that will play  
6 out in the next couple of weeks. The goal of all of  
7 them, as Mike said, to talk about content, to talk  
8 about instructional practice in reading mathematics,  
9 so that still remains the goal, so -- and certainly  
10 when he talked about the materials, he talked about a  
11 illustrative materials around curriculum, around  
12 instruction, items that can be used for both testing  
13 and instructional purposes. So I think clearly it's  
14 clearly articulated. It's a goal. I can't give you  
15 a detailed road map of every point in the process of  
16 every point in the department that will address that  
17 right now.

18 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

19 MR. THIEMANN: Gary Thiemann, CTB. Any  
20 further word on the printing aspect of any contract,  
21 where it's going to be, how it's going to be handled?

22 MS. KOLE: Still, we're thinking about

1 it.

2 MR. THIEMANN: The reason I see this as  
3 an important piece is if you were discussing the  
4 demonstration, et cetera, et cetera, aspect and  
5 generally it sounds like that is all going to be  
6 rolled into what the licensing contract is going to  
7 be.

8 MS. KOLE: What would be best in your  
9 perspective?

10 MR. THIEMANN: Well, there are certain  
11 traditional ways in which some of these functions are  
12 done today in the commercial world. And there are  
13 multi-functions that are done out there either by  
14 individual companies or by I suppose you could say  
15 joint ventures or agreements between companies to do  
16 development of tests, the publication of tests, i.e.,  
17 printing, to do the scoring and reporting, things  
18 like administration are not usually commercial  
19 functions, at least the kind of setting we're talking  
20 about here. There may be other settings in which  
21 that function is tied in, like the ability to benefit  
22 tests, but elementary, secondary education testing is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not usually done that way. So you're adding in  
2 components that don't have relevance and don't have  
3 historic precedent, in a way much of this is handled  
4 today, and yet sounds like you're removing certain  
5 things like the printing side of it, that haven't  
6 really seen the light of day yet. I was curious as  
7 to where all this was going to shake out if that was  
8 really all going to be eliminated from the developmental  
9 part or is the printing going to be put into  
10 developmental as opposed to licensing?

11 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, it's a good question  
12 and it does, you're right, there are sort of two  
13 options. One is it's a part of a developmental  
14 contract. The other part it's paid for through the  
15 licensing and reimbursement process.

16 This is all tied up with the whole  
17 licensing issue.

18 MS. KOLE: Or possibly some combination.

19 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

20 MS. KOLE: Really haven't worked it  
21 through.

22 MR. PHILLIPS: We won't forget it though.

1       It will be somewhere.

2                   MS. KOLE:   Well, won't it be better from  
3       an industry perspective, for example, for those test  
4       -- we figure in terms of --

5                   MR. THIEMANN:   I can't speak for --

6                   MS. KOLE:   What I'm trying to understand  
7       is whether there would be the capacity to print this  
8       at the state and local level, for example, presumably  
9       test publishers might be more so -- we're talking  
10      about this as an add-on to existing batteries of  
11      tests so presumably there would be some role that  
12      entities out there might want to --

13                  MR. THIEMANN:   Well, that's what led me  
14      to raise this was that with the essence of -- you  
15      mentioned, Gary, a local decision on reporting. That  
16      ties into the same issue of purchasing tests, so that  
17      those functions sort of go together and development  
18      of a test and printing of a test, decision by the  
19      local board or district to decide to acquire a test  
20      and use it, the administration is not getting  
21      involved in that, usually, but the scoring or  
22      reporting do.   So usually that's a local option to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 purchase a test and relatively scoring and reporting  
2 functions with it.

3 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. I don't know which  
4 side the issue will come down on at this point. The  
5 question here, it boils down to, does the test  
6 development contractor absorb the cost of printing,  
7 that is, does it pay for the cost of printing, or  
8 does the district or school pay for, let's say  
9 through a license site and in 1999 that means we  
10 would be reimbursing them with that cost?

11 MR. THIEMANN: Which means you'll have  
12 multiple printings.

13 MR. PHILLIPS: Exactly.

14 MR. THIEMANN: Along with multiple  
15 scoring and multiple reporting.

16 MR. PHILLIPS: That would be the downside  
17 of going in that direction, that's right.

18 MR. ELFORD: George Elford, ACT. In your  
19 earlier discussions, there's also security in all of  
20 this.

21 MR. PHILLIPS: Right.

22 MR. ELFORD: One of the main functions of

1 a licensee I guess is test security which in the area  
2 of printing and distribution there seems to be a  
3 logic that that would all be together on the  
4 licensing side of the house, if the licensing manager  
5 is responsible for security.

6 MR. PHILLIPS: Right. On the other hand,  
7 I'm not -- this is just another way of looking at it  
8 which is security might be enhanced by having it  
9 being done by one contractor as to a whole bunch of  
10 contractors.

11 MR. ELFORD: Either way, but it's still  
12 going to be under the licensing contractor rather  
13 than the development contractor.

14 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

15 MR. JONES: Calvin Jones, just thinking a  
16 little bit about logistics on the one hand and  
17 performance measurement on the other. I'm sure you  
18 don't need to be reminded of all people about the  
19 famous NAEP anomaly where one of the explanations was  
20 there was a number of small differences of design and  
21 administration conspired to producing a chance.

22 MR. PHILLIPS: We're not allowing any

1 anomalies in this test.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. JONES: In that case, one has to  
4 think very carefully about all of the aspects that  
5 make up constant administration -- uniformly print a  
6 document that seems to be one of those major  
7 features. And if one thinks about the logistics of  
8 producing 8 million of them you don't wait until the  
9 last two or three nights to print them.

10 MR. PHILLIPS: Do you think this would be  
11 solved if, just like we have scoring sites, we have  
12 printing sites, licensed printing sites, so that  
13 there might be a number of them? I don't know how  
14 many, but all of them are in agreement that certain  
15 procedures have to be followed and certain levels of  
16 quality control and security are maintained and it's  
17 just like scoring, you could go to one company for  
18 printing, another one for scoring and things like  
19 that. Do you think that would solve the problem?

20 MR. SNOWHITE: Larry Snowwhite, Riverside.  
21 One of the elements of all this discussion is  
22 whether the test is going to be free-standing or

1 administered as part of other tests, so that  
2 compounds the logistical security standardization,  
3 etcetera, etcetera, problems because if you have a  
4 centralized printing that would work if it's an  
5 individually administered site, but it won't work if  
6 it's at an integrated site.

7 MR. PHILLIPS: My assumption is that if  
8 this test is to be administered along with another  
9 one which we would encourage, that it not be  
10 commingled, the administration not be commingled  
11 which implies that you might for example have this  
12 test administered one day and the other test  
13 administered another day. But you don't want to have  
14 them either back to back and you certainly don't want  
15 to have them being done at the same time. So that's  
16 the way I think that would come out on that.

17 MR. SNOWWHITE: Will that be specified in  
18 the RFP?

19 MR. PHILLIPS: We can do that, yes.

20 MS. KOLE: The licensing?

21 MR. PHILLIPS: In the licensing, right.

22 MR. SNOWWHITE: That's a good idea. that

1 will require a lot of writing.

2 MR. PHILLIPS: Right, part of the  
3 licensing agreement, not a part of the development  
4 RFP.

5 MR. SNOWHITE: Right.

6 MR. THIEMANN: Gary, Alan Thiemann, CTB.

7 If I may just follow on to that, but not necessarily  
8 are they mutually exclusive. If you're building  
9 stand alone tests as opposed to tests that are  
10 supposedly, I believe the quote in the original press  
11 release was "as part of" other tests that are being  
12 administered in school, that I think you've got a  
13 different issue, even how you go about item  
14 development.

15 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, but at this point I  
16 would be uncomfortable saying that we're developing a  
17 test that could just be plopped in the middle of  
18 another testing program. I mean just think of it for  
19 obvious reasons. Let's say we have 90 minutes of  
20 testing and let's say that in your testing program  
21 you have 60 minutes of testing or you have 120  
22 minutes of testing, so the time limits, the testing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conditions and administrative procedures and the  
2 training and all that is different in different  
3 testing programs. So we would like this to be a part  
4 of your testing program, just like, for example you  
5 might use a norm reference test and a criterion  
6 reference test as an integrated sort of thing that  
7 gives you a better picture of what's going on. But  
8 you don't want to give that norm reference test as  
9 part of your criterion reference test. Those are  
10 standardization procedures.

11 So I think they need to be kept separate  
12 in that sense, otherwise, we wouldn't be able to make  
13 really consistent inferences.

14 MR. SNOWHITE: Can I just follow up on  
15 something that -- Paul Snowwhite, Riverside -- raised  
16 in Title I. Will the guidance on assessments used  
17 for Title I have to assure consistency with the  
18 technical standards that you're going to be requiring  
19 for the national test, specifically that Title I  
20 assessments be valid and reliable and consistent with  
21 the joint technical standards?

22 MR. PHILLIPS: This is a question that

1 Mike Smith needs to answer. Title I is not my  
2 program, so I don't mean to be a cop out, but --

3 MR. SNOWWHITE: I didn't expect an answer.

4 MR. PHILLIPS: Okay, I don't have an  
5 answer.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. SNOWWHITE: I just wanted to raise it  
8 for the record.

9 MR. PHILLIPS: It's a good question.

10 MR. CONATY: Maybe since people are  
11 asking questions that they don't expect to be  
12 answered, maybe we've reached the point where we  
13 should thank you all and say we appreciate -- a  
14 number of you have been here for all of the meetings.

15 Others of you for just the first time. We  
16 appreciate all of this input and we are, as you can  
17 tell, trying to be responsive to the issues you raise  
18 and look forward to your responses to the RFP, the  
19 draft RFP, whatever comments you have for us.

20 Thank you again.

21 MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you very much.

22 (Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the meeting

1       was concluded.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15